SIPE			Docket No.
			112701-066
READERCATION Of: Ba	llevre et al.		
Serial No. 09/508,635	Filing Date May 18, 2000	Examiner D. Lukton	Group Art Unit 1653
Title: ORGAN SPECIFIC NUTI	RITION		
Return Receipt Postcar	for Reconsideration of Requirem	MISSIONER FOR PATENTS:	SEP 2 7 2002 TECH CENTER 1600/2900
as described bel ☐ Charge	is required.	ached. I to charge and credit Deposit Ac et is enclosed.	count No. 02-1818

Robert M. Barrett (30,142) ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANTS Bell, Boyd & Lloyd LLC P.O. Box 1135

Signature

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

I certify that this document and fee is being deposited on 9/19/2002 with the U.S. Postal Service as first class real under 37 C.F.R. 1.8 and is addressed to the Assistant commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231

Dated: September 19, 2002

Signature of Person Muiling Correspondence

Robert J. Buccieri

Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

cc:



## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants:

Ballevre et al.

Appl. No.:

09/508,635 May 18, 2000

Filed: Title:

ORGAN SPECIFIC NUTRITION

Art Unit:

1653

Examiner:

D. Lukton

Docket No.:

112701-066

Commissioner for Patents Washington, DC 20231

## RESPONSE AND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF REQUIREMENT

Sir:

Applicants submit this Response and Request for Reconsideration of Requirement in response to the Office Action mailed on August 20, 2002. In the Office Action, the Patent Office has required Applicants to elect a specific organ as a species. Applicants hereby provisionally elect the small intestines. However, Applicants note that this election is made provisionally. In this regard, Applicants reserve the right to Petition the Commissioner From Requirement for a Restriction Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.144.

Applicants hereby expressly traverse the species requirement. In the first instance, Applicants note that all of the claims are generic to the claimed species. Accordingly, there is no purpose for the election of species requirement. Indeed, the election of species will only create undue burden both for the Applicants and the Examiner.

Moreover, Applicants have previously pointed out that the election of species requirement does not comply with the MPEP, see, for example, MPEP § 803.01. For the sake of brevity, Applicants will not repeat the previous arguments and traversals made, for example, in the response submitted on July 24, 2002. In this regard, all of the statements made in Applicants' previous traversals are incorporated herein by reference.

1

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office examine the invention on the merits and withdraw the election of species requirement. The election of species requirement does not comply with the requirements of the MPEP. Moreover, the election of species requirement will only result in increased work and undue burden to Applicants and the Patent Office.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

By

Robert M. Barrett Reg. No. 30,142

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4204